



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/776,930

02/11/2004

Philip Ted Kortum

1033-LB1040

2364

60533

7590

09/14/2007

TOLER SCHAFFER, LLP
8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE
SUITE A201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

WANG, CLAIRE X

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/776,930		KORTUM ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Claire Wang		2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2,13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' response to the last Office Action, filed on July 2nd, 2007 has been entered and made of record.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on July 2nd, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In response to Applicant's argument that "Bryenton does not disclose a memory to store at least eight built-in images per bill denomination for a plurality of bill denominations, the at least eight built-in images comprising a corresponding image for each of four corners for each of two sides of the bill denomination as recited by claim 1." It is noted that Ohnishi teaches an optical bill denomination detecting system, wherein the detectors detect the numerical figures (or the amount of money) printed on the four corners of a bill (Col. 2, lines 20-24). It is well known that a bill has two sides and thus each bill should contain eight detectable corners. Even though Ohnishi does not explicitly teach detecting the bill amount using eight corners, however it would be obvious for one ordinarily skilled in the art to try to detection using eight corners.

b. In response to Applicant's argument that "Bryenton does not disclose an output selector that has a tactile output mode, an audible tone mode, and a speech mode." It is noted that Bryenton teaches that the speakers of the audio output may be replaced by a tactile device or other suitable output devices (Col. 4, lines 51-52), meaning the user of the system decides which output device the system is using. Thus, the user selects the output of the system.

c. In response to Applicant's argument that "Bryenton does not disclose a tactile output device to vibrate in a pattern unique to the denomination of the bill."

It is noted that that Bryenton teaches the voice output indicates the denomination of the bill (Col. 4, lines 29-30) and it is also noted that the voice output may be replaced by a tactile device (Col. 4, lines 51-52). Thus, the tactile device used to replace the voice output should also indicated the denomination of the bill and thus must use some sort of tactile output signal to indicate to the user.

Therefore, it would be common sense that the output tactile device would vibrate in a pattern unique to the denomination of the bill.

d. In response to Applicant's argument that "Nishito does not disclose a camera to capture an image of a bill." It is noted that Nishito teaches it is also possible to use a two-dimensional scanning device such as a video camera as well (Col. 14, lines 29-32).

e. In response to Applicant's argument that "Slotkin does not disclose a key fob to house the memory, the camera, the pattern recognizer and at least one output device." It is noted that Slotkin teaches an electronic business card exchanger, that includes storing a business, which requires memory; also, includes sending and receiving images using a physical connection or a wireless connection (Paragraph [0030]). It is noted that although Slotkin does not explicitly teach the key fob also containing the camera and the pattern recognizer, it would be obvious for one ordinarily skilled in the art to try to add the additional components. Also, it is noted that almost anything maybe used as a key fob, thus making the claimed components obvious to try.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryenton et al. (US 5,692,068 hereinafter "Bryenton") in view of Nishito et al. (US 4,464,786 hereinafter "Nishito") further in view of Ohnishi et al. (US 4,611,345 hereinafter "Ohnishi").

As to claim 1, Bryenton teaches a personal bill denomination reader (portable hand-held bank note reader; Col. 1, lines 12-13) comprising, a memory (21 Fig. 2), a pattern recognizer to match the image of the bill to one of the built-in images in the memory (matching the obtained pattern with the patterns stored; Col. 2, lines 41-44); and at least one output device to report the denomination of the bill based on the match from the pattern recognizer (providing output signal means after the comparison has been made; Col. 2, lines 18-25). However, Bryenton teaches capturing an image of the bill using CCD and does not teach capturing an image of a bill using a camera. Nishito teaches a system to identify currency notes using a line sensor. Nishito also teaches that it is possible to use a two-dimensional video camera to replace the line sensor (Col. 14, lines 29-32). Thus, the video camera input of Nishito reads on the

claimed camera input. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace the CCD of Bryenton with a video camera of Nishito since they are considered interchangeable.

Bryenton also does not teach the memory stores at least eight built-in images per bill denomination for a plurality of bill denominations, the at least eight built-in images comprising a corresponding image for each of four corners for each of two sides of the bill denomination. Ohnishi teaches a bill identifier device that divides the region of the bill into zones (Fig. 7) and each zone is identified and matched to verify that it has the same amount. Each side of the paper bill is has four zones (zone 11, 12, 21, and 22) and each is compared and matched with the content in memory (Fig. 9). Since each paper bill has two sides thus each bill will contain eight zones. Thus Ohnishi's zones read on the claimed eight built-in images of four corners for the bill denomination. Therefore it would have been obvious for one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bryenton's portable hand-held paper bill reader with Ohnishi's zone identifier so that even when a paper bill is ripped or stained using all eight sections of the paper bill it is still possible to identify the bill amount (Ohnishi Col. 1, lines 25-30).

As to claim 3, Bryenton teaches wherein an output selector to determine a mode to report the denomination of the bill (provide a synthesized voice indication of the denomination of the bank note; Col. 4, lines 27-32).

As to claim 4, Bryenton teaches wherein the output selector has a tactile output mode, an audible tone mode, and a speech mode (the output speakers can be replaced by a tactile device or other suitable output device; Col. 4, lines 50-51).

As to claim 5, Bryenton teaches wherein the at least one output device comprises a tactile output device to vibrate in a pattern unique to the denomination of the bill (the output speakers can be replaced by a tactile device or other suitable output device; Col. 4, lines 50-51).

As to claim 9, it differs from claim 1 in that claim 9 does not teach about the memory storing at least 8 different images of the bill, and claim 9 further teaches of a tactile output device to generate a tactile output unique to the denomination of the bill based on the match from the pattern recognizer (the output speakers can be replaced by a tactile device or other suitable output device; Bryenton Col. 4, lines 50-51).

As to claim 14, it differs from claim 1 in that claim 14 only teaches the memory section of claim 1. Please see the memory analysis of claim 1 for detail analyses.

3. Claims 6, 7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi as applied to claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 14 above, and further in view of Rhoads et al. (US 6,278,441 hereinafter "Rhoads").

As to claim 6, Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi teach the output can be a tactile device or other suitable output device (Bryenton Col. 4, lines 50-51). However, they do not teach the tactile output device is a dynamic Braille display to generate a Braille representation of the denomination of the bill. Rhoads teaches a monetary denomination reader for the visually impaired. The reading device can communicate with a Braille output device (Col. 7, lines 5-11). Thus the Braille output device of Rhoads reads on the claimed Braille display. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to further include the Braille output device of Rhoads with the portable bill reader that has a tactile output device, since the Braille output device belongs in the same group as tactile output devices.

As to claim 7, Rhoads teaches wherein the at least one output device comprises a pressure display having a component that rises and lowers in a pattern unique to the denomination of the bill (Rhoads shows that the output device for his monetary reader is a Braille output, by the definition of Braille each character or number is coded using a series of dots in a specific way, thus by having a Braille output it is clear that each unique denomination would be communicated to the user; Col. 7, lines 5-11).

As to claim 10, Bryenton teaches wherein the tactile output device is to vibrate in a pattern unique to the denomination of the bill (a tactile device or other suitable output device; Bryenton Col. 4, lines 50-51).

As to claims 11 and 12, they are the same as claims 6 and 7. Please see above for detail analysis.

4. Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi as applied to claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 14 above, and further in view of Slotkin et al. (US 2005/0103838 hereinafter "Slotkin").

As to claim 8, Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi do not teach wherein a key fob is used to house the memory, the camera, the pattern recognizer, and the at least one output device. However, by definition, a key fob is a decorative item that many people carry with their keys. Almost anything maybe used as a key fob. Slotkin teaches a key fob device that has storing capabilities and the ability to send and receive images (Paragraph [0030]). Although Slotkin does not teach all of the capabilities of the claimed invention it is obvious that the other capabilities of the invention may be added. Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the key fob memory stick of Slotkin with the portable bill reader of Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi to facilitate easy carrying (Slotkin [0030], line 13).

As to claim 15, it differs from claim 8 in that claim 15 further teaches the output device is a tactile output device (a tactile device or other suitable output device; Bryenton Col. 4, lines 50-51).

5. Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi as applied to claims 1, 3-5, 9 and 14 above.

As to claim 16, Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi teach a personal bill denomination reader. Claim 16 differs from claim 9 in that Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi does not expressly disclose the personal bill denomination reader is in a mobile telephone and the tactile output device further to vibrate to alert of an incoming telephone call. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that vibrate alert of a mobile phone, memory of a mobile phone and camera on a mobile phone is well known in the art. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to put the portable bank-note reader of Bryenton in a mobile phone since Examiner takes official notice that vibrate alert of a mobile phone, memory of a mobile phone and camera on a mobile phone is well known in the art.

As to claims 17-18, they are the same as claims 14, 13 with the exception of putting them in a mobile phone, which was discussed above in claim 16. Please see claim 16 for detail analysis of the mobile phone portion of the claims.

6. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bryenton, Nishito and Ohnishi as applied to claims 16-18 above, and further in view of Armanto et al. (US 6,094,587 hereinafter "Armanto").

As to claim 19, Bryenton teaches the speakers for reading the denomination can be replaced by a tactile device or other suitable output device (Col. 4, lines 50-51). However Bryenton does not teach of an output selector to determine a mode to report the denomination of the bill. Armanto teaches a ring tone selector for the user to choose (Col. 1, lines 37-41). Thus the ring tone selector of Armanto reads on the claimed output selector. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to let the user choose the output of his or her liking (Armanto Col. 1, lines 35-36).

As to claim 20, Bryenton teaches wherein the output selector has a tactile output mode, an audible tone mode, and a speech mode (the speakers for reading the denomination can be replaced by a tactile device or other suitable output device; Col. 4, lines 50-51).

As to claim 21, Armanto teaches an audible ringer to alert of an incoming telephone call, the audible ringer to generate one or more distinctive, non-speech tones unique to the denomination of the bill based on the match from the pattern recognizer if the output selector is in the audible tone mode (Col. 1, lines 37-41).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 2 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Claire Wang whose telephone number is 571-270-1051. The examiner can normally be reached on Mid-day flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samir Ahmed can be reached on 571-272-7413. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Claire Wang
09/10/2007



SAMIR AHMED
PRIMARY EXAMINER